



I

7



ADDRESS

BY

PRINCIPAL GRANT

BEFORE THE

Private Bills Committee of the House of Commons,

ON MARCH 16th, 1882,

With Reference to

THE TEMPORALITIES FUND BILL.

Ottawa, Ont. :

Printed at the Office of the Daily and Semi-Weekly Citizen, Metcalfe Street.

1882.

Pr

On

Con
Con
Pri
sign

yes
uni
I su
pet
my
unc
yes
fair
pro
mar

ADDRESS OF
PRINCIPAL GRANT

BEFORE THE
PRIVATE BILLS COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS
MARCH 16, 1882,

On Consideration of Bill No. 66, "An Act to Amend the Act Intituled 'An Act to Incorporate the Board for the Management of the Temporalities Fund of the Presbyterian Church of Canada in Connection with the Church of Scotland,' and the Acts Amending the Same."

The Committee met at 10.30 a.m.

THE CHAIRMAN (Mr. Cameron, Victoria) invited Mr. J. L. Morris, Counsel promoting the Bill, to name some gentleman to address the Committee in favour of the Bill. Mr. Morris named the Very Rev. Principal Grant, of Queen's College, Kingston, and the Committee signified its pleasure that he should be heard.

PRINCIPAL GRANT.—The Committee were assured at the outset yesterday that the question before the Committee is not a question of union. I hope to show before I finish that it is that and nothing else. I submit that the hundreds of Presbyterian congregations who are petitioning the House are better judges of their own business than even my learned friend Mr. Macmaster. It is to be supposed that they understand what they are doing. Mr. Lang twitted Mr. Macdonnell yesterday with wishing to know the facts about his Church. It is only fair to say that we have a right to know. When gentlemen ask for our property it is surely reasonable that we should ask who they are, and how many they are. I am perfectly well aware that a question between majori-

ties and minorities is not necessarily determined by the number on either side; but I am also aware that if I am in a minority I should not attempt to magnify my minority beyond what it is. Give justice to one congregation; but do not let the one call itself one hundred. When wild statements are made in the newspapers as to the numbers of the dissentients it is only fair that we should know the facts, now and here, especially as there is not a public document anywhere in which that information can be had. If you turn to the Canadian Almanac you find the numbers of ministers and congregations of every denomination in Canada except that of the Synod of which Mr. Lang is Moderator. Even after all the efforts made yesterday by Mr. Macdonnell and by members of the Committee, we failed to get the information. We learned, indeed, that there were 13 ministers present at the last meeting of their Synod, but Mr. Lang is perfectly well aware that quite a number of those could not be constituent members of Synod, because they were retired ministers; that, perhaps, only about half of the thirteen were ministers of congregations in Quebec and Ontario. That Synod, then, must still be represented by the algebraic formula of X, an unknown quantity. This is not our fault, because we have asked very respectfully and earnestly for the information, believing that it is due to us and to the Committee that the facts should be given. Does this House incorporate any society till it knows the truth as to its numbers and property? It would be well, surely, as every other Church gives those facts in published minutes, in year books and in almanacs, that the Synod X should follow the well understood practice. While Mr. Macdonnell was twitted with "wanting to know," it is quite evident that Mr. Lang knows more about our Church than we do. He is amazed at the small number of our petitions compared with the number of our congregations. He sees a contradiction between Mr. Fleming's statement that we have about 1,000 congregations and Mr. Morris' statement that we have more than 700 ministers. I see no contradiction. It is well known that there are at all times vacant congregations, and it is also well known that some ministers have two congregations. There is not the slightest shadow of contradiction. The statements of those two gentlemen, as anyone who knows them might readily believe, were perfectly and literally accurate. With regard to the number of congregations petitioning, it is a well understood principle that silence gives consent. Has any one of those thousand congregations petitioned against our legislation? Not one. There are some dreadful people, it seems, in our Church, called Voluntaries, and Mr. Lang thinks that these are opposed to our action. If Voluntaries exist anywhere they are to be found in the Metropolitan Presbytery of Toronto. It is one of our 33 Presbyteries, and it alone has five times as many ministers as this so-called Synod. Well, that Presbytery met the other day, and unanimously and heartily agreed to petition, and it has petitioned, in favour of our Bills. Every Presbytery, as it meets, will do the same,

should it be deemed necessary. Mr. Lang even objected to the small number of the Committee applying for legislation. Surely, whether a Committee consists of four members or forty makes not the slightest difference. Our way is to appoint a Committee, and we never dream of asking whether the Committee is small or large. It does the work. Besides, we have seeking this legislation not only the Committee appointed by the old Synod, but the Committee of the General Assembly in defence of Church property. Our way of doing business may be a very foolish way; but it is our way, and no Presbyterian would dream of there being any other way. Everyone will see at once that, as to our calling a meeting of the General Assembly, the thing is out of the question. It is not needed. Besides, to call a meeting of a Synod of thirteen clergymen, half of them relieved of the cares of congregational work, and to summon a body consisting of 400 representatives, from British Columbia to Newfoundland, are two very different things. If we did so, it would excite public feeling immensely, and that is not desirable, surely. It would be a most unwise proceeding to take. I think the Committee may rest assured that our Church is a unit on this subject, and if my friend fancies that we are disunited he is trusting to a devout imagination. However, these are all small matters, and I would not have referred to them had they not been brought up by our opponents; it was necessary that I should clear the way by these preliminary observations. I now go on to the real question before the Committee. I take it for granted that this Committee wants to get at the root of the matter, and not merely to be entertained with a threshing of old straw as to details that has been threshed for eight years before the country, till not a particle of grain is to be got out of it.

The Committee wants to get at the principles involved in this case. Well, Mr. Chairman, I think that there are two principles involved, and if I do not prove these I have no case. I think I can prove them, and if proved, two sets of consequences logically follow. The first principle I would ask this Committee to consider is, has a Church any freedom of action as regards uniting with another Church? It may seem easy to assent to such a question, but the whole case rests upon this very simple question. I put it in another form: Is there any possible way of one Church uniting with another? I would like that question to be understood by the Committee. Is there any possible way, yes or no, of one Church uniting with another? Well, we believed, and we still believe, that it is possible for one Church to unite with another. Believing that general statement, everyone will admit that, *a fortiori*, two Churches that are one in doctrine, as we were and are; one in Church government, as we were and are; one in Church discipline, as we were and are; one in modes of procedure, as we were and are; one in generic name, for we were all Presbyterian; one in race, as we were and are; one in spiritual ancestry, as we were and are, may unite; that if

any two Churches can unite we could. I suppose that will be admitted. Does any member of the Committee doubt that it was *possible* for our two Churches to unite? If you admit that it is possible for two Churches to unite, then these were surely the two that could most easily unite. Actually they were one so completely that we never, when disunited, could explain to an outsider why we were not one. I could never get it into the head of an Englishman or an Irishman why we were two. After all my explanations to intelligent strangers, the rejoinder invariably was, "Oh! you Scotchmen have a passion for metaphysical and theological hair splitting that we cannot understand." I never succeeded in explaining our position to an Englishman; at least, I explained, but he would not understand. Again, no one, I think, doubts that such a union was for the benefit of the people concerned; for their benefit in pocket, in peace of mind and conscience, in the forgetting of old feuds instead of warming their hands and hearts at the ashes of the decaying fires which their ancestors kindled in another country. It was better for the people as a whole, and the country as a whole, better so far as the general lifting up and sweetening of public life and religious life were concerned, that these two churches should not remain hostile, but that they should be one. Now, I urge this point because both Mr. Macmaster and Mr. Lang evaded it completely. They graciously conceded that an individual, or individuals, could leave one Church and join another. I think it was unnecessary to come all the way from Montreal to tell this Committee that. Not only did Mr. Lang admit that individuals had the right to leave any Church, but he told us that he wished to give a hearty God speed to all such people. Well, I am not disposed to gush over people who leave their own Church to join another; I am inclined to think that, as a rule, they would do better to remain in their own Church. If they think that they are too good for the Church, they had better remain for the Church's sake, and try to make the Church better; if the Church is too good for them, they had better remain in it for their own sakes. So, while we grant the principle fully—and it is quite unnecessary to say much about it—I am not, I say, as much disposed to gush over such restless individuals as Mr. Lang seems to be. But the point before us, as these gentlemen are well aware, is this: whether it is possible for Churches to unite? That is the question. We maintain that it is possible, and that if any two Churches could unite those were the two. That is my first principle. Have I made it plain? Is there any member of this Committee disposed squarely to deny that Churches can unite? The second principle is this: Did we go the right way about our union? That is a still more important question. Did we leave anything undone that could be done? I want the Committee to be seized of this. I would like any member of the Committee—when I am done, or during the discussion—to mention to me one thing that we omitted to do. Certainly we did not hurry about it; there is no question about that. You see, gentlemen, our Synod

consisted, as a rule, of grave, wise, steady going men, who were not in the habit of boiling over with enthusiasm, and, above all, who had no notion of effecting union through the door of disunion. They had no notion of uniting, if they could not go in as a Church. They repudiated such an idea. They wanted to lessen not to increase the number of sects. If we had dreamed that our action would have led to disunion we would never have thought of action. We were so long a time about it, from 1870 to 1875, that Mr. Lang pleaded pathetically yesterday that his moving the adoption of the basis of union in 1871 should not be referred to now, because there was such "a very long time" between 1871 and 1875. That means, in other words, that he adopted our basis of union in 1871, and that if we had only been quicker, if we had only been in a hurry about it, if we had had, for instance, a little Methodist fire and alertness, Mr. Lang would have been in the union.

REV. MR. LANG.—My resolution was for amending, not adopting.

PRINCIPAL GRANT.—Amending on a small point, but adopting, as stated yesterday, the basis of union. Rev. Mr. Macdonnell seconded your resolution. Mr. Lang now says, to justify his position: "There is such a thing as principle; there is such a thing as conscience." No doubt, Mr. Chairman, but I would he had found the principle sooner. Mr. Lang had influence in our Synod. Not only did he move approval, but he was an alternate member of a Committee to draw up the basis of union. When we appointed that Committee, we appointed an alternate for each member of it, so that should any member be ill a substitute might take his place. Mr. Lang was an alternate, and so remained for years. There were doubtless humbler and younger members who were ready to accept the principle of union because so influential a minister as Mr. Lang was in favour of it. Is he not responsible for their action? Is he not responsible for the position they now occupy? I wish to say this to the Committee most emphatically, that if Mr. Lang and his friends had said at the outset, "We are in principle opposed to this union; we in conscience are opposed to it," then, Sir, not only the gentlemen who are acting with me here, but the whole Synod, would have dropped at once all negotiations for union. That would have been the last of it. Our position was this: "Union is a good thing, but not at the price of disunion among ourselves. We are sorry that these gentlemen have such consciences; we could wish that their consciences were more enlightened; but as they are conscientiously opposed to union we must drop the subject and attend to our ordinary work." He now says: "I am in favour of union, but am I to sacrifice my position as a Minister of the Church of Scotland; am I to give up my orders?" Mr. Chairman, I will not characterize that language by the expression used by Mr. Lang in reference to an accurate statement made by Mr. Fleming—"mendacious." The word is unparliamentary, and therefore

I shall not use it. But, Mr. Chairman, if the figurative and expressive word suggested by Mr. Macmaster's friend, Mr. Buntin, yesterday, is parliamentary—"balderdash"—I would use that. Mr. Lang knows well that entering into union involves no sacrifice of position or of orders. Now let me come to the point. What was the right procedure for us to take when we desired to effect union? I think I have established that it was possible to unite, that if ever two Churches could unite we were the two. What was the right method for us to take? Three things had to be done. First, we had to proceed constitutionally, as far as our own Church was concerned. Secondly, we had to proceed constitutionally as far as legislation was concerned; and, thirdly, we had to deal with courtesy towards all men, especially towards those with whom we were most nearly related. We would not unite until we had taken these three steps. First, what did we do as regards the Church? After unanimously approving the principle again and again, after unanimously adopting the basis of union, we acted according to the constitutional method of our Church, and the constitutional method of all Presbyterian Churches, as stated by the authority that these brethren recognize, our own book of forms, and "Cook's Styles of the Church of Scotland." According to these authorities, when the Supreme Court is attempting a constitutional change, it must send it down to the lower Courts, that they may consider and vote upon it. They return their views to the Supreme Court. We sent it down to these lower Courts, called Presbyteries. Presbyteries hold somewhat the same relation to the Supreme Court that Diocesan Synods hold to the Provincial Synod of the Church of England. We sent the question, then, down to the Presbyteries, and ten out of our eleven Presbyteries reported in favour. A few changes were made to suit men who objected, and it was sent down again, and then every Presbytery adopted it; so that we had not only our Synod, but every one of our lower Courts, on the side of union. That is all that the Constitution of the Church in Canada, or of the parent Church, required us to do; because, gentlemen, our Courts are understood, like your high Court of Parliament, to represent the people. Our Synod and Presbyteries have no \$5 or \$50 men in them. They are representative.

MR. MACMASTER.—Or half a million dollar men.

PRINCIPAL GRANT.—No; our Church does not believe in selling the right to deliberate or the right to vote. That, I say, is all we need have done. The Presbyteries had spoken, and that was enough. But we said, "This is a matter on which people feel strongly; we are living in a country that is essentially democratic in spirit, and we will send it down to the congregations. And when did we send it down? Only after they had had time to discuss it and re-discuss it. It had been in

every paper for years, and the people knew what was involved. They knew that any congregation that did not vote would be held as assenting to the well understood mind of the Synod on the subject. As a matter of fact, it was understood that those congregations that did not vote were in favour of union. Those congregations came into the union, and are in to this day. What, then, was the result of appealing to the congregations? Why, a greater degree of unanimity than could have been anticipated; vastly greater, certainly, than you ever expect to get in Parliament. Out of 150 congregations only 10 voted nay, and in almost every one of those ten, minorities were favourable to union. Was it possible ever to get a larger popular majority than that on this planet? Having thus got our Synod and all our lower Courts in favour, and having seen what the general mind of the Church was, what did we do? Unite? No; not yet. We said: "We are an independent Church, no doubt of that."* The Act was read to you yesterday; that Act of Independence was assented to by Mr. Lang; it had to be assented to by every minister of our Church; they could not have been inducted as ministers otherwise; an Act declaring in the strongest way that as a Church we were independent.

MR. MACMASTER.—Only ecclesiastically.

PRINCIPAL GRANT.—Ecclesiastically and spiritually. We do not pretend to be more than that now. We went to the proper Courts for temporal legislation.

MR. MACMASTER.—And lost there.

PRINCIPAL GRANT.—No; we never went to law; we went to the law making power; and we now come to headquarters for our law. This is a legislature, that is, a law making body. I say, then, gentlemen, that we were an independent Synod. Mr. Macmaster anticipated, but anticipated erroneously, what I was going to say on this point. He should have had patience, as he will see when he hears my next sentence. I say that we considered that, while independent as a Church, we were gentlemen, and it became us to remember the claims of courtesy.

MR. MACMASTER.—You did not care about the Courts.

PRINCIPAL GRANT.—What we did before the Legislatures will be brought before you fully in the proper place. Is it not better to take things in order?

THE CHAIRMAN.—Yesterday the speaker was allowed to proceed without interruptions, unless to correct a statement on a matter of fact. The speaker ought not to be interrupted.

* See Appendix for proof that the Canadian Church was independent.

Mr. McLEAN.—I don't know that I have any right to say anything now, but yesterday the speech of Rev. Mr. Lang, who sits beside me, was continuously interrupted. Certainly as much freedom ought to be allowed on the present occasion.

THE CHAIRMAN.—I think we had better go on without interruptions.

Mr. MACMASTER.—I stand corrected.

PRINCIPAL GRANT.—I say that, though an independent Church, we remembered the claims of courtesy. We felt, therefore, that we should consult the Mother Church and ask if she approved of the step we were about to take. And, Mr. Chairman, though we were absolutely independent, though our relations with the Mother Church were only those of sympathy, friendship and assistance from her, still, if that venerable Court had said: We disapprove of the step you propose to take; your basis of union does not satisfy us—if she had given one such hint, why then the union would have stopped there and then. We owed the same courtesy to the parent Church that I have already said we would have shown to Mr. Lang and his friends had they at the outset declared themselves opposed to union. What, then, did the Mother Church say? Not only did she declare emphatically, as was read yesterday, her approval; not only did the General Assembly state that there was nothing whatever in the terms of union that prevented her approving or wishing us "God speed"; but the year following, when Dr. Jenkins and myself were delegates, and mentioned that the union had taken place, but that some dissenters in Canada considered that our action savoured of disloyalty to the parent Church, the answer was emphatically to the contrary. The motion that was to be submitted to the Assembly was read to us beforehand, and we were allowed to add what is now the last sentence in it. I will read the sentence:—

"The General Assembly, having learned from the deputies that an impression exists in Canada that the Church of Scotland regards the action of those connected with her in Canada in forming the union now consummated as an indication of disloyalty to the parent Church, assure the deputies that they entertain no such idea; but, on the contrary, give full credit to the representations which they have received from the brethren on that subject."

Mr. MACMASTER.—Will you read a sentence before page 282. I do not like half a statement going to the Committee.

PRINCIPAL GRANT.—I will read the whole of the deliverance:—

"The Assembly have heard with much interest that the union of Presbyterians in the Dominion of Canada has at length taken place. The terms on

which this union has been effected having been brought under the consideration of the last General Assembly, and that Assembly having declared that there is nothing in those terms to prevent the Assembly from wishing God speed in their future labours for the Lord to brethren who propose to accept union on that basis, or from co-operating with them in any way that may be found possible in the new state of things, the General Assembly resolved to record, and through the respected deputies from Canada to convey to the brethren in the United Church of the Dominion, an expression of their earnest prayer that God may be pleased to hallow and bless the union, and to make it the means of promoting peace as well as all the other interests of religion among the people. The Assembly, at the same time, regret to learn that the threatened division in the Canadian Synod of which intimation was given in the Report to the last General Assembly has, to some extent, become a reality. As to different views of duty in regard to accepting or rejecting the union, this Assembly, like all former Assemblies, express no opinion; but, being persuaded that those brethren who have declined to enter the United Church, not less than those who have accepted the union, have acted under a strong sense of duty, the Assembly assure them of their continued regard and desire for their prosperity and usefulness. And, while the Assembly will not cease to pray and use such means as may be within their power, and entreat their brethren in Canada to unite in the same prayer and efforts, that all heats may be allayed and any remaining division may be healed, they will cordially continue to co-operate in any possible way with both parties in promoting the religious interests of their colonial brethren."

Then follows the last sentence, which I have already read. That is the resolution passed in my presence at the meeting of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland in May, eighteen hundred and seventy-six.

MR. MACMASTER.—They gave them both a blessing.

PRINCIPAL GRANT.—That shows that they did not disapprove of our action. What is more, they continue to give us money.

MR. MACMASTER.—You will have money; there is no doubt about that.

PRINCIPAL GRANT.—Ministers do not care for money, but I am speaking to laymen. However, grants of money are a substantial expression of opinion that all men can interpret. Now, Mr. Chairman, having thus constitutionally taken action in our own Church, and having got the approval of the Mother Church, did we unite? No. We had first to see what the Legislatures of the country—the men we had elected for the purpose of dealing with temporal affairs—would say to the proposal. There was a contrast drawn by Mr. Macmaster yesterday between Providence and Parliament. He, being a member of a Provincial Parliament, ought to know. I did not know that there was such a marvellous distinction. I decline to believe that there is. My way of finding out the meaning of Providence, so far as the relations of man to man from day to day are concerned, is by learning what the

people say—not what a crank, who claims to be inspired, says—but what the people say. That is what Providence means. We know no other way of ascertaining whether a proposed measure is just, so far as property rights are concerned. Who are the legislators? The men that we, as citizens, elect that they may deal with property. And why should we affect to despise men appointed to such high trust? Have we not to render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's? We had to know—before union, mark—what the Legislatures would say to our proposal to unite. Now, I wish to call the particular attention of the Committee to this one point, the point that completely differentiates our case from all the others that were mentioned by my learned friends opposite yesterday. They spoke of "secession." Does not the Committee see the difference between a secession acknowledged to be a secession—or a minority going out of a Church without getting Legislation—and a Church taking action subsequent to having obtained Legislation authorizing the action? Is that not the whole point of difference? If either of my friends went into the House of Commons to record a vote, he would be told that he had no right there. But any man duly elected has. So radical is the difference between our case and those cited by them. If a minority choose to go out of the Church without Legislation, they must go without their property; no doubt of that. But we went as a Church, and we always said, "We shall not go until we get legislation, and if we cannot get it we shall not go at all." That was our position from first to last. Very good, then. We had, as my friend says, "the hardihood" to go to the Legislature. Well! I like to get into intellectual sympathy with opponents, if possible, but I cannot understand why our respectfully asking the Legislature to do the very thing that it exists to do should be called hardihood. We are told, also, that it is "fresh hardihood" to come here. I cannot understand Mr. Macmaster's position, or rather his language. It seems to me that we have come asking the Legislature to do the very thing that it exists to do; that and nothing more. We went, first, to the Legislatures that everyone believed to have jurisdiction; there is no doubt of that. True, as Mr. Macmaster says, we were "ill advised." I think the word might have been spared, unless it was merely technical, as I suppose it was. We did not ask Mr. Macmaster's advice; well, Mr. Macmaster is still a young man, and he would not add to his age, I am sure.

MR. MACMASTER. — You forget Pitt's remark.

PRINCIPAL GRANT.—No; but even he will admit that he was younger eight years ago than he is now; and Mr. Macmaster will admit—because he has not only ability but modesty—that we asked men who were his peers.

MR. MACMASTER.—Can you produce any opinions from any lawyer of standing in this country that you would cite in the Courts—produce any opinion in writing?

PRINCIPAL GRANT.—I will do better than that. Mr. Macmaster's own words were, "All the Courts of this country were wrong on the subject."

MR. MACMASTER.—Show us the opinion from the proper source.

PRINCIPAL GRANT.—It would take a good while to give all the opinions, and your own admission is sufficient for the Committee. We went, then, to the Local Legislatures. Now, if they had refused to give us the required legislation, what would we have done? Simply nothing. At that time we had the cure in our own hands; the Churches could have remained as they were. We would have done nothing; we would have waited; we would have thrown the responsibility on those Legislatures, and left them to settle the matter with their constituents. And when any of our people came to us and said "Why don't you unite? Have you not been already five years talking about it? You ministers are so fond of talking that you never do anything," we would have answered: "We have done all that we can, but your representatives will not give us the necessary power. We cannot worship in this cold country in the open air, and the Legislature declines to let us take our churches with us." Would not that have been a perfectly proper position? Would there have been any "hardihood" in that? Then, we had the remedy in our own hands. And mark, gentlemen, it would not have been wonderful if those Legislatures had refused our request, for all the representations that were made here yesterday, and a good many more, were made to them. These gentlemen opposed to us to-day were at Quebec and Toronto, and, the union not having been accomplished, they were able to prophecy wonderful things. They told the members that it was a delusion to imagine that the majority was in favour of union. They warned them over and over again of the disastrous consequences that would result from passing our Bills. Yet, notwithstanding all those representations, the Legislatures gave us the Bills we asked—in Toronto, unanimously; in Quebec, unanimously in the Lower House, and after they were discussed for several days in the Private Bills Committee of the Upper House, during which time the Committee was swayed to and fro by the sonorous eloquence of Mr. Lang, and the incisive dialectic of Mr. Campbell, of Montreal, they at last passed, without division, through the Upper House also. We then, having got the legislation required, at a subsequent meeting of Synod, by a vote of 90 to 7, resolved to unite.

MR. LANG.—Was there no division in the Committee at Quebec ?

PRINCIPAL GRANT.—Certainly ; I did not say that there was not.

MR. LANG.—You said it had passed unanimously. It was thrown out of the Private Bills Committee in the Upper House.

PRINCIPAL GRANT.—It was, and it was then taken in again. I will go into full details if you desire ; but, to save *our* Committee's time, it is surely best to summarize. I will now pause and ask : Will any gentleman say what more we should have done ? If it is possible for two Churches to unite, if the two before us were the ones above all others to unite ; if the right course as concerned our own Church, the Mother Church and the Legislatures was taken ; will any gentleman mention one step that we omitted to take ? I have asked this question again and again, of keen critics, and they have not been able to mention one point that we omitted to take. I may say here, in answer to the question that was put yesterday by a member of the Committee, to show how far the principle that I have established will go, that the case supposed by him is covered by it. If the same action were taken by our Synod, or our General Assembly, with regard to the Church of Rome ; if the General Assembly again and again unanimously voted to unite with the Roman Catholic Church ; if it appointed deputations and committees to meet with the bishops of that Church, and the joint committees agreed upon a basis of union ; if they sent that basis down to the Presbyteries and every one of our now 33 Presbyteries had accepted it ; if fourteen-fifteenths of the congregations assented heartily ; if the parent Church approved of it ; and if then the Legislature of the country had stamped the proposed union with its approval, and had said, "Unite, and take your property with you," we and the Church of Rome could unite and form one Church. Whether it is probable or not that any of us shall see all those circumstances in combination, as to what may happen in the millenium, it is not for me to say.

MR. MACMASTER.—Would you take your property also ?

PRINCIPAL GRANT.—I said that we certainly would if the Legislature gave us permission, did I not ? However, I will go over the argument again if need be ; but I would like to spare the Committee—they understand.

MR. MACMASTER.—I am doubtful if they do.

PRINCIPAL GRANT.—My friend is hearing on the wrong side of his head. I have often talked with him and never found him so slow

to understand. Now, having established the principles that Churches may unite, and that in this case they proceeded in the right way, two sets of consequences follow naturally, logically and irresistibly. I wish to submit these to the Committee. First, what follows as regards the parties in the case? I wish members of the Committee to consider this calmly, for the question hinges here. The Local Legislatures having given us the necessary legislation, the Minister of Justice and His Excellency the Governor General in Privy Council having assented to those Acts, was or was not the public faith pledged to us if we went in to the proposed union? Mark, gentlemen, had this taken place before Confederation there would not have been, there could not have been, a shadow of doubt or difficulty on the subject. Why? Because there was then only one law making power in the country. There would have been no doubt—there would have been no need of asking to what Legislature we should have gone. We would have been neither ill advised nor well advised. We would have had to go to the one Legislature of Canada, and then the thing would have been settled. But you are all aware that under the British North America Act the law making power of Canada is divided between the Local and Dominion Legislatures, and I understand that within its jurisdiction each is supreme. I am willing to be corrected if anyone denies this or any point I make. I wish, then, the Committee to consider this question: Seeing that the Local Legislatures are a part of the law making power of Canada, when they acted in good faith, and we acted in good faith, and when their Acts were assented to by the Governor in Privy Council, was or was not the public faith pledged to us? It seems to me that in the case even of a landlord and his steward there can only be one answer. Suppose, for instance, the steward, in virtue of a written instrument, had made a bargain with regard to some property with a company or an individual, that the steward believed he had power by virtue of the instrument, that the landlord believed that he had the power, and that the company then, on the faith of that, went in and invested all its property and bound up the fate of their wives and children with their action. Suppose then that through the pertinacious investigation of some ingenious lawyer, seven or eight years after, it was found that this instrument did not technically give the steward the necessary power, would not the company come to the landlord and say, "Of course you will make this all right"? And would he answer "Oh! it is preposterous; if you hold the property legally you can hold it; if not, go to the Courts and find out your rights there." A landlord would have the power to say that: would an honest landlord say so? Gentlemen, you are the honest landlord. If right would be done in the case of a landlord and his agent how much more so when it is between two constituent Legislatures who are the law making power of the country? For if the one Legislature despises the other, then there can be no harmony in our Dominion.

May I be pardoned if I illustrate this by a concrete case. I wish to show how we, trusting to the public faith, acted. Sometimes men can see more clearly when a thing is stated in a single case than by abstract reasoning. Perhaps the Committee will pardon me if I take the case with which I am most familiar. I do so with the less hesitation because Mr. Macmaster referred to Queen's College in his speech yesterday. Well, four or five years ago I was requested by the Trustees of Queen's University to accept the Principalship of that Institution. The Trustees, acting under the Ontario Act, appointed me. No one objected; no one told me that they had not the power. Even if Mr. Lang had told me, I should have thought the Legislature knew its own business better than my candid friend did. At any rate, no one did tell me. Now I am told that because of an inference from this decision of the Privy Council the appointment was illegal, and that I have no right to be Principal. Here is a writ that was served the other day. An injunction is claimed against the Trustees. You know what an injunction meant as regards the Temporalities Fund—it locked it up. What does an injunction mean as regards Queen's College? Why, if no administration can take place for two or three years, you might as well give me a box of matches and ask me to put it under the institution. It took 7 or 8 years to get one question about the Temporalities Fund settled. If Queen's is closed for that length of time it had better be closed altogether. Yet we are told to go and litigate; that we have no remedy. What does this one case mean? It means that I am sent back to my native Province. That is a small matter. I have no objection to go back; I cannot get my old position, but doubtless I can get another. But there are other matters involved that cannot be mended. During the last 4 or 5 years I have got over \$150,000 subscribed for Queen's College, that is, more than double the amount of the whole permanent endowment of this Temporalities fund; for we were shown yesterday that the permanent endowment was only about \$60,000. I got that \$150,000 from over one thousand people. For whom? For the institution in connection with our united Church. Not an anti-Unionist gave a dollar. They said it was theirs; but they proved that they did not believe their say, for they would not put a dollar into the College. And, gentlemen, I cannot return that \$150,000; I have not got it; it has been absorbed. It has been spent on buildings, museum, library, apparatus, and the endowment of professorships. Professors and assistants have been appointed. They are not in connection with this so called Synod, and cannot hold their positions unless they beg to be admitted—that is, they must publicly dishonour themselves. I return then, to Nova Scotia, and I return with this lesson stamped on my forehead—should our Bills, owing to the representation of these shortsighted men, be rejected—that the Parliament of Canada is indifferent to the public faith, helpless to remedy a great wrong, contemptuous of the solemn Acts

of the Legislatures of Ontario and Quebec, sanctioned though these were by His Excellency and his Privy Council. That is one instance. That is one illustration of how we, as a Church, acted during the past 7 or 8 years. I could give scores, but I need not. A public man can see at a glance how far reaching the effects of such a course on your part would be. For example, our contention with our anti-confederate friends in Nova Scotia has always been that when the public faith was once pledged to Confederation it was as impossible to undo Confederation as it would be to dislocate a living body—that the public faith was pledged, that the Provinces became then dovetailed, commercially, legally, politically, socially and religiously, into one compact political organism. You cannot wipe out history, even for a few years. It is impossible to put the shadow back on the sun dial, or the hands on the clock of time. In a word, a social organism must grow or it dies. It must always grow. Once a man has attained the age of 20, not all the King's horses and all the King's men can make him 12 years of age. But these men think that all this is possible. Should they be listened to, a blow would be struck at the public faith that would be irreparable. We, having trusted to it, would be betrayed. Mark again, had we gone into this union before Confederation, there would have been no doubt or difficulty on the subject. We then had the cure in our own hands. We then could have said: "Very well; we can wait." But, because of an ambiguity in the British North America Act, an ambiguity for which we certainly are not responsible, we are told that we must take the consequence. We were not the authors of that Act. The ambiguity of that Act deceived the Judges of the country. But simply because of that ambiguity we are told that we are helpless. Helpless! No; I beg pardon of this Committee for assuming, even by hypothesis, that they will listen to the representations of these men. I say the public faith is pledged to us. Is it or is it not? Pledged to what? you ask. Pledged to this, that we are the historic "Old Kirk" of Scotland in Canada; that the Presbyterian Church of Canada includes the Old Synod. If any man asks, "Where now is the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland?" we answer, "In the Presbyterian Church of Canada." But Mr. Macmaster asks, "How can that be? when you united with another body you then lost your identity." When a man unites with a woman does he lose his personal identity? I thought he simply became *totus, teres, atque rotundus*, a complete man. Mr. Macmaster seemed to admit that, but he was staggered at the size of the body. That is, he would imply that in case I marry a woman bigger than myself my personal identity is lost. What became of the personal identity of Solomon, "the sad and splendid," with his several hundred wives?

MR. MACMASTER.—What about marrying three women?

PRINCIPAL GRANT.—Well, is the man's personal identity lost? King Solomon married more than three. But I think the Committee sees this. I would ask very respectfully: Where is old Canada, the old Province of Canada, now? Is it in this Dominion or is it not? There were minorities opposed to Confederation in every Province. Suppose a few Canadians, discontented with the Act of Confederation, had gone away down to Sable Island; suppose that these soreheads had gone off to any other equally delightful spot, and said: "This spot is old Canada, and we will keep our country." We all know that Canada is ten or twenty times as big as she was; that her very name was changed from the Province of Canada to the Dominion of Canada, and that it might have been changed entirely. There was a question whether it should not be so changed, and I believe it was left to the Queen to fix the name. But Mr. Macmaster would argue that if one man had remained a sorehead, it would be for him to stand up, like Simon Stylites, and to call out to the Universe: "Behold Canada! *L'Etat c'est moi!*" Or, in our case, "*L'Eglise c'est moi!*" But we are asked, "Was there not a contract?" A contract with whom? Where in our Minutes is it called a contract? Mr. Macmaster calls it that. He says, and says truly, that the Synod of 1855 implored its ministers to commute in order that, under Providence, the money might be a permanent endowment to the Church. They did so by a majority. When the Church accepted the gift, did that mean that the Church sold her liberty of action for all time to come for \$60,000?—for that is the amount of the permanent endowment.

MR. MACMASTER.—Does not the Privy Council say that the fund was £127,000?

PRINCIPAL GRANT.—I am speaking of the amount of the permanent endowment. I think I have explained so that every member of the Committee can understand it. I do not guarantee for Mr. Macmaster. But I will explain it more fully. The amount originally received by the Church was calculated upon the basis that the ministers had been for a year or two previous in receipt of \$600 a year. Their lives were calculated according to the Carlisle Tables of Longevity, and the total amount came to \$509,000. What did that mean? It meant, if these gentlemen got their \$600 a year, that at the end of their lives, if those tables were correct, there would not have been a dollar left. Now, what they kept for themselves I do not call a permanent endowment. But they said, "We will take \$450 a year." Calculate how much that would leave, and you will find that it left about \$121,000 as a permanent endowment. But then came in another factor. Between the passing of the Act in Canada and its passing in Great Britain, 11 new ministers joined the Church. They Synod said: "These are as much entitled to annuities as we are." But the Parliament of Canada said: "No, we

will not recognize those 11 ministers." "Well," said the Synod, "we will put them on the list as men privileged to get \$400 a year." That was made a condition also. That would consume about \$61,000; and so only \$60,000 were left for a permanent endowment, and the Church increased that by general subscriptions up to about \$78,000. The tables are here, and I can go over them one by one and show to you with absolute accuracy that that is the sum of the permanent endowment. I think the Committee understand.

MR. MCLEAN.—I do not think so.

PRINCIPAL GRANT.—They can speak for themselves. They are remarkably silent, as compared to the brethren opposed to us. Silence gives consent. Now, says Mr. Macmaster, the act of the commutators was "sacramental." All I have to say to that, is that I must do a great many sacramental acts. I never ask for money for Queen's College without making the same prayer as the Synod. I say to subscribers, that I hope and believe, under Providence, this money will be a permanent blessing for the Church and the country; that it shall be a permanent endowment. Do I mean by that, that the Church has no freedom of action? Do I mean that this Parliament has no freedom of action? That the clutch of the dead hand is on every dollar that is given? I am talking to reasonable men. All that is meant is that the spirit and fundamental conditions of the gift must be observed. Where, then, is the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland? It is identical, as I declared, with the Presbyterian Church of Canada. Now, with regard to that, I am sorry to have to call attention to language of Mr. Lang about which I would rather say nothing. The last Minute our Church passed before it united was one declaring its identity in these very words, which I read from the authorized Minutes:—

The Synod in resolving to consummate the Union "does at the same time declare that the United Church shall be considered identical with the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland, and shall possess the same authority, rights, privileges, and benefits to which this Church is now entitled, excepting such as have been reserved by Acts of Parliament."

Further, next day, when we went into the Union, this Minute was read to the General Assembly of the United Church. It expressly declared, and no one dissented, that the one Church was identical with the other. Mr. Fleming temperately said so in his memorandum. Mr. Lang comes out over his own name and calls the statement of Mr. Fleming mendacious. "I decline," he says, "to discuss so mendacious a statement." Mr. Chairman, language is inadequate to characterize so extraordinary a method of argument; I am quite satisfied to leave the matter in the hands of the Committee. I say now, if we are the Church, as

I have proven, what are they? Simply what they call themselves, "dissentients." They could be nothing else. Mr. Lang admitted yesterday that 15 were necessary to form a quorum, or constitute a meeting of the Synod. Then, we ask, how could 7 or 9 constitute a Synod? "Oh!" he says, "they just considered that it was the same *sederunt*, and went ahead with the business." He forgot, or forgot to state, that the Synod had adjourned, and that these men of necessity took part in the adjournment, and that by no possibility could it be the same meeting.

REV. MR. LANG.—In the face of a protest.

PRINCIPAL GRANT.—Of course they protested. They have never done anything else. But the Committee is aware that if two or three members of the House of Commons protest against the House adjourning, the House can adjourn all the same, and the protest of the two or three rebellious members makes no difference.

MR. MACMASTER.—They cannot dissolve themselves entirely.

PRINCIPAL GRANT.—We are talking of an adjournment. Suppose that the House of Commons should find it necessary, because its Chamber, for some special occasion, was not large enough—precisely our case—suppose that the House, because of an alarm of fire or for some other reason, should resolve to adjourn to a larger hall for a few hours, and that they did adjourn, and regularly departed, with the Speaker at their head, the Clerks, the Mace—whatever the Mace may mean—and that a few malcontents remained, and, pretending that they were the House of Commons, passed laws; would these be binding on the people of Canada? Suppose that some one should say to the malcontents, or dissenters, "Why! you have not even a quorum," the ready answer would be, "Oh! to the eye of sense we are only 9, but to the eye of faith we are 200. We include in our number the men who have gone away to do the wicked thing against which we have protested. It is the same *sederunt*." Quoting a Latin word like that, you know, would clinch the argument. "The same *sederunt*!" Mr. Chairman, if 9 could do this when 15 were required, could not 5, could not 3 do it? Could not 1 sit in solitary grandeur, and say, "I am the Old Kirk; I am going on with the business?" I see by the Minutes that there were more members at our meeting in the morning than when the vote was taken the evening before. 126 members of Synod went, with moderator, clerks and documents, to the larger hall; 9 dissented, and they have remained dissenting protesting and litigating to this day. And still they cry, "Give us more litigation; don't legislate, gentlemen." They have fared so long on litigation that they want nothing else. I think that I have shown what follows from the principles proved at the outset, as regards the parties

in this case. May I now submit another point. What follows from the two principles established, as regards other Churches, so far as their relations to Parliament are concerned, should this remedial legislation be refused? This Parliament is just. It will measure to others—I give no taffy—but I think I may assume that Parliament will mete to others the measure that it metes to us. Now, if you take, with regard to us the action our opponents desire, what must be taken with regard to other Churches? First, as regards the future: Parliament must refuse legislation to any Churches that resolve to unite, should there be one man opposed to such union. You must say, “You cannot do it; this one man has the right to the property. Oh! yes, you may unite, but you cannot take your property with you.” What does this mean? It means that in the future, if there should be a man in any Church sufficiently foreseeing, he may take such a line as this: He may say, “My Church is ready to unite with a sister Church. I will support the proposal. I will move the adoption of the basis of union. I will get my brethren hopelessly committed. I will let years pass away, till my action has perhaps been forgotten. Then, when the others are ready and all things are in readiness, I will quietly rise in my place and say, ‘Gentlemen, of course you are perfectly free to unite, but I shall remain and I shall demand all the property.’” Is not that possible? Is not that what you in principle say, if you refuse this legislation? And this may be a good man, too. He may be convinced that he is doing right; he may take his stand upon principle, and say that his conscience is enlightened. There is not the slightest doubt that this could be done, and this Parliament, having taken its position already, is bound to that position, for, as I said, you will mete to others the measure you mete to us. And you are likely to be called on to act in the future, gentlemen. At this very moment there are two cases likely enough to come before Parliament some day. The Methodist Church and the Methodist Episcopal Church are talking about union. I see in the newspapers that they are having district meetings, and that these meetings are unanimously in favour of union. Suppose, now, that all the district meetings and conferences unanimously resolve to unite; that they have arranged the details and have got everything settled; then, after all the leading ministers and the men who will not go back from their positions have committed themselves, and they come to you for legislation, should one worthy man rise up and object, you must say to these half million Methodists, or their representatives, “We cannot do what you ask; we have taken our position; you can go into the union, but that protesting individual claims all the property, and it must remain with him.” Take another case. The dioceses of the Church of England in the North-West are not now united with the Provincial Synod of Canada. They are connected with the Mother Church in England. Suppose they agree—and I hope they will—that there should be but one Episcopal Church in Canada, as there is one Presbyterian Church, and as there

may shortly be one Methodist Church, in Canada; suppose then that they come here for the necessary legislation. If one man in the four dioceses up there objects, you will have to say: "Yes, you can unite with your brethren, but only at the expense of your property; we have laid down that principle and must stick to it." Is this Parliament willing thus to commit itself with regard to the future? And what follows, also, with regard to the past? Something more startling, because the past you cannot wipe out, whereas the future is warned. With regard to the past, you lay down this principle, that any existing minority may now claim the whole property of Churches that united. Are you aware, gentlemen, that there were dissentients, not only from the Kirk, but from the other negotiating Churches; that, for example, there were two or three worthy ministers of the Free Church who remained out and who still remain out of the union. These Clergymen believe that their brethren were false to their covenant; they thoroughly believe—and, what is more, they believed from the first; they did not get new light—that they are the only true Free Church in Canada, and that the hundreds of their brethren who united thereby ceased to be Free Churchmen. But these ministers did not know, or did not care to use, the immense power they had. They quietly remained outside, just preaching the Word of God, and even sending their contributions to their brethren who united. They said "We are too weak to institute missions of our own; let us then do some humble work in the way of aiding the great missions of the United Church." But, when they hear that this legislation has been refused us, they must discover that they are entitled to all the property of the Free Church; that Knox College, Montreal College, the Widows' and Orphans' Fund, and all the endowments of their former Church, belong to them. My friend Mr. Macmaster made the ludicrous mistake yesterday of saying that the Free Church had no endowments, and was even opposed on principle to endowments. In some respects it had larger endowments than we had. And that any man should entertain the idea that the Free Church was opposed to receiving endowments! Could he think that there was any such Church on this planet? He startled you, and no wonder. There are Churches that will accept endowments only on certain conditions. To dream that any Church would reject them utterly is a ludicrous mistake. They are only too glad to get them. Our complaint generally is that you do not give us endowments enough. But, Mr. Chairman, these worthy dissenting Free Church brethren, when they find that they are the old Free Church, will of course claim and get all the property of their former Church. You say that that would be preposterous. It would. So is the contention of our dissentients. I think Sir, that I have established the two principles with which I set out. I heard no dissent from any member of the Committee. I heard no question from any member. I had no interruption. I think that I have also proved conclusively what follows as regards ourselves,

and
latun
about
not p
satis
they
on b
fami
other
voted
tives
do n
neith
life i
Can
roots
was
infan
Colle
tlemen
Did
the n

your
the n
They
Empl
partic
fund
positi
not b
What
Our l
had b
major
union
for t
They
them
that
ficiari
contro
consti

and what follows as regards the relations of all Churches to this Legislature, if you accept those propositions. Now, one word in conclusion about the treatment the minority has received. I am aware that it is not pleasant to be in a minority, and that as a rule minorities are not satisfied. I am aware that minorities sometimes do not get what they think they are entitled to. Remember that there were minorities on both sides, in our case. There was a minority consisting of forty families at least, represented here by Mr. Morris, Mr. Dennistoun and others, in Mr. Lang's own Church. These, finding that the congregation voted itself out of the union, had to choose between two sore alternatives. They said, "We are in a minority and we have to submit. We do not desire to leave our pastor and our old congregation." But neither do we want to remain in a Church whose sole end and aim in life is litigation. We do not want to be separated from the currents of Canadian Church life. Therefore we will tear ourselves up by the roots from the old St. Andrew's Kirk, Montreal." One of these men was the Superintendent of the Sabbath School; his wife taught the infant class; others were elders; another was a professor in McGill College; others were liberal supporters and workers. Did these gentlemen go and call themselves the St. Andrew's Church of Montreal? Did they demand the property? No. They felt that they, being in the minority, must put up with it the best way they could.

MR. MACMASTER.—They were the seceders.

PRINCIPAL GRANT.—Or "dissentients"; in this case, just as your friends were in the case of the whole Church. They were the minority, and therefore they went out peaceably and quietly. They got nothing. Was that the way we acted with our minority? Emphatically, no. Members have sometimes said: "Oh! both parties in this case are extreme; each party wants the whole fund for themselves." Sir, that is their position. It is not our position. Mark you, their position and our position are represented, not by what this or that man says, but by the Bills before you. What say the Bills? Their Bill says, "Vest all the property in us." Our Bill says, "Give to the members of the minority all that they ever had before; give to them all that it is proposed that each member of the majority shall have; give them all that they ever would have had, if no union had taken place." Well, they say that it is humiliating for them to receive their annual payments from another Church. They do not receive them from any Church; they receive them from a Board on which they are represented, and that Board is responsible, not to our Church, but to the beneficiaries. Whenever you pass our Bill the beneficiaries will have control of the Board, and if they want amendments to the constitution they will come to you for them. The beneficiaries are the

only men who can propose amendments. Our Church does not pretend for a moment to interfere with it, and cannot interfere. It is said, again, "Cannot you come to a compromise?" I thought, two or three weeks ago, that if we could meet privately and arrange to have only one Bill here, it would save the Committee all this trouble. The response I got from the gentleman with whom I communicated was substantially this, that since we had voluntarily left the Church we had better return to it voluntarily. I felt that when men spoke so stoutly, their position must be good. I looked into their position and saw that they were the victims of a fatal, resistless, one sided logic. Their position is logical. The only compromise is that contained in our Bill. For, that Bill was intended as a compromise from the first. It is a compromise, too, by the beneficiaries, the only parties competent to make one. From the first, the fund was one fund. From the first, the ministers could commute only through the Synod. They lost all if they left the Synod. From the first, the fund was to be administered in the interests of the Church. Commuters who left Canada, even to become parish ministers in Scotland, lost all right to it. This was so, prior to union. It seems to me, then, that the way to violate the original trust is to break the fund up into two or more parts. They say: "Give it to us, for we are the Church." If they are the Church, I say: "Give it to them." Their position is logical, I grant that fully. But, though we are the Church, we do not ask for all. Our Bill is a compromise. Our Bill says, "Let it be administered by the Board, subject to the beneficiaries"

MR. MACMASTER.—Do you offer to divide it with us?

PRINCIPAL GRANT.—We do divide it with you by our Bill. I asked if any further compromise could be effected, and I have told you the answer I received.

REV. MR. LANG.—What was the answer?

SIR ALBERT J. SMITH.—Is it too late now to compromise?

PRINCIPAL GRANT.—I think it is, because the two Bills are here. I think a large body like this Committee cannot go into the exact particulars of a just division; the only body competent to do that is the beneficiaries. The original fund was one trust, and it was never intended to be broken up. I think the only way now is to proceed and to take the compromise offered by our Bill, and leave the matter with the beneficiaries.

MR. MACMASTER.—Do you now make that statement? I would like to say here, while that question of compromise is up, that

the side I have the honour to represent are not averse to a compromise. They take the position in the Bill that this fund should be vested in the Old Church, because the Privy Council judgment says that it must be administered in accordance with the Act of 1858, which says that it is for the benefit of the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland. We claim to be logical, as my friend says, and we must ask that the fund be vested in that Church. We must take that position in our Bill. And I want to say, on behalf of our friends, that to a fair, and just, and reasonable compromise we are not averse. We have an offer of compromise made to us, but we do not consider it a just offer of compromise. But we say now, and I have authority to say, that the Church of Scotland people will be prepared, on receiving their Act of incorporation, to accept such compromise as may be deemed just and reasonable in the opinion of reasonable and disinterested men. We only ask for justice.

PRINCIPAL GRANT.—It is to be regretted that even so much was not said yesterday, when a member of the Committee asked Mr. Macmaster what he would consider fair, and the answer substantially was: "Give us the whole." No man on the Temporalities Board made the offer Mr. Macmaster refers to.

MR. MACMASTER.—Are you not aware that an offer was made by Mr. Sandford Fleming?

PRINCIPAL GRANT.—Certainly; but neither of us is a member of the Board. I have already stated that, two or three weeks ago, I hoped that an amicable arrangement was possible, and I did my utmost to try and have it brought about, hoping that I would be met in the same spirit. I was not so met. Then, feeling that gentlemen, who could afford to snub me, must feel that they occupied an impregnable position, I looked more closely into the case, and, as I said, I found that they were certainly logical.

Rev. MR. LANG.—I cannot allow that statement to pass without correction, if the Committee will allow me. That there was a compromise spoken of I freely admit, and terms were spoken of, first to Sir Hugh Allan, and next to Mr. Macmaster and myself. But I am not aware, and I would not like the impression to go abroad in this Committee, that there was a distinct offer on either side. But it has passed, and I think that Principal Grant might, in common fairness, mention it now. We did meet once or twice, and very naturally the question arose: Can you carry your friends with you? Dr. Grant knows that that actually did pass. Mr. Sandford Fleming knows that that passed between us. But these gentlemen are not in the forefront of this movement. Dr. Grant has nothing to do with the Temporalities Fund.

He did not, in origin, belong to the Synod of the Church of Scotland in Canada, and we very naturally asked : For whom do you speak ? And the inquiry was made, either by these gentlemen or for them, whether such proposals as had been spoken of in conversation would be entertained by those who were really in the forefront of the party, and the answer was unequivocally returned that they could only speak for themselves, and could not guarantee that those who were in the forefront would agree to proposals that might be made. I think that, in common fairness, the matter should be put in the right form. There was no breaking off of negotiations on the subject, none whatever. Sir Hugh Allan can bear out this statement. I say it boldly at the bar of this Committee, there was no bar put on the subject ; the bar was distinctly because those who were not in the forefront of this movement could not come forward and authorize these gentlemen to speak for them.

PRINCIPAL GRANT.—I am generally supposed to have "common fairness," and, if this Committee think I exaggerate in one point, it is I who shall suffer. I fully understand my position. Since the matter has been brought up in this way, then, I may say something further. No summary of mine, it seems, can satisfy these gentlemen. As already stated, I did think two or three weeks ago that if we could get together and come to some arrangement, all this contest might be avoided. I did hope and pray that it might be avoided ; and so, when Mr. Fleming brought Sir Hugh Allan to see me, I asked if he had any details to submit. He said he did not know the details, but that as their body was small it would be easy to get details from them, whereas our body was large and it would not be so easy. My answer was : "I know that ; I can only speak for myself ; but I will tell you what I will do. If I think your proposals reasonable, I will go before the Committee and advocate them. If it is worth your while to acquaint me with such proposals, I will tell you in a moment whether I consider them reasonable or not." Acting on that, when these gentlemen came up we had a little talk together, and a division of the Temporalities Fund was suggested. I think that Mr. Macmaster referred to a division as possible, when he handed me a copy of the *Montreal Gazette* containing the report of his address to Sir John A. Macdonald in introducing a deputation, saying to me that the address embodied his views. I saw, when I read his address, that he suggested that, while they claimed the whole Fund, it would be a generous thing on their part to give us about a third.

MR. MACMASTER.—Are you quoting entirely ?

PRINCIPAL GRANT.—Am I not stating it correctly ?

MR. MACMASTER.—I wish to keep you correct.

PRINCIPAL GRANT.—The desire to do so is most manifest. But in what point have you shown me to be incorrect? I read the newspaper report and I saw that it was substantially this, that, while they claimed all, it would be a generous act on their part, and the most that could be asked of them, to divide the fund and give to us, the vast majority, about one-third, while the two-thirds remained with them. Was, or was not, that substantially your statement?

MR. MACMASTER.—Don't attempt to cross examine me. Don't think although you are Principal of a College you can put to me a categorical question. (Loud cries of Order! order! from the Committee.) I desire to be respectful, gentlemen, and I also desire not to be misrepresented, and I expect that I shall not be, before a fair Committee. I stated to Principal Grant that I was acting in the capacity of lawyer; that the views I was authorized to put forward were embodied in the newspaper which, I believe, he holds in his hands now. I there made a statement of what I conceived to be a reasonable position, but I told Principal Grant that I was not authorized to compromise the matter, but that the view put forward was mine, as far as I was concerned, and that it would be better for him to come properly authorized from the side he represented to meet plenipotentiaries or representatives from our side properly authorized to settle this matter, and they could then come, perhaps, to some reasonable and just basis of settlement. Principal Grant proposed to me another basis, which I do not think could be entertained. From that day to this, with the exception of a letter that was written by Mr. Fleming, I have had no communication with the gentlemen whatever. I thought they had given up the compromise idea completely. Still, that was the view then put forward; a view that seemed reasonable, considering our legal victory and from a legal standpoint. I now say, and have always said, that so far as our side is concerned we are disposed to what may be considered a fair and reasonable compromise in the minds of reasonable and disinterested men. They may think they are entitled to one thing, while we think we are entitled to another. We are, doubtless, both biassed. But my constant position was this, that whatever just and reasonable men would consider to be a right and proper compromise, so as to put an end to this struggle, would be acceptable to us.

MR. MACDOUGALL.—Some members of the Committee are of the opinion, and I apprehend that, as has been stated by Principal Grant, it is also the opinion of the gentlemen concerned, that these discussions, and proposals, and attempts at settlement and compromise, which came to nothing, are of no particular interest to us.

THE CHAIRMAN.—I was just going to make the same remark. I think it would be better for Principal Grant, so soon as convenient,

to finish his address. We have allowed him very considerably to exceed the allotted time. After that, in accordance with the understanding, I believe a gentleman from the other side will be heard, and then I will have a suggestion to make to the Committee in reference to these Bills.

PRINCIPAL GRANT.—I am delighted to see that the Committee understands the case. I would have ended my remarks long ago had it not been for wholly irrelevant and unnecessary interruptions. Gentlemen, the question just comes back to the point from which I started. Did we, as a Church, do a right act, a competent act, and did we do it in a right way, so far as human foresight could suggest? We know that we did a right thing; I have proved that we did it in the right way. You know it, and history has shown it. Our progress since the union has been at the average rate of 20 congregations and ministers a year added to our Church; that is, double the number, each year, of the whole anti-unionist body. Whereas not one young minister has joined them; not one convert whose name they can quote has joined them during all these eight years. The young men of Canada know where the Church is.

REV. MR. LANG.—We have three Divinity students. We have ministers who have joined us since 1875.

PRINCIPAL GRANT.—It is a pity that their names are not given. Mr Lang seemed to object yesterday to our union, because it is not comprehensive enough. He is willing, that is, to take the whole flight of stairs, but not the first step. I want to know who is the truest friend of union, the man who, standing at the foot of a flight of stairs, says, "I would like to get to the top, but I decline to take the first step," or the child who is willing even to crawl up the stairs, one step at a time? Mr. Lang says, "If any man is a Christian he is my brother." Surely we are Christians and brothers; can he not, then, worship God and do His work in this land with us? It may be that this form of Christianity is like that well understood by Wamba, the son of Witless. When the knight craved forgiveness of the fair Rowena, she answered, "I forgive you with my whole heart, as a Christian," and Wamba whispered "which means that she does not forgive him at all." A Scotchman, possibly the ancestor of a gentleman in this room, was dying. The good priest told him that he could not shrive him until he forgave his enemy. He held out, but the priest was firm. The old man then looked at his wasted arm, unable to wield a brand, and slowly uttered the required formula, "I forgive him." Being shriven, he turned to his son, who stood, like a young Hercules, by his bedside, "And now, Donald, your father's and your grandfather's curse be upon you if you forgive him." This is Christian union—or Christian forgiveness. It is like DeBracy's idea: "There is Bois-Guilbert, whose religion is to hate a

Jew, and the Templar, whose religion is to slay a Saracen, and if these are not good Christians I would like to see who are." So, the Christian idea now is, "Let us have litigation." Friends of union! What is a man's love for all women worth if he is not willing to marry one? I am supposed by my friends to be as Catholic as Mr. Lang, but I speak of my Catholicity only in fitting places. I speak of my love for other denominations when I am not expecting anything from them and at other fitting times. I was touched yesterday, however, I must say, at Mr. Lang's allusion to the Church of Scotland. It drew me to him more than anything else he said. I saw that there was a tide of generous Scottish feeling, or prejudice, running in his veins. And I do not honour a man who has no national "prejudices." But can he not believe that Canadians are animated with like sentiments for the land of their birth? Can he not believe that there is a tide of generous enthusiasm for our country boiling in our veins, and that we do not think that there is any disloyalty to the old Church when she has expressly repudiated the notion. Are we not to love the land in which we were born, the natal soil where our children and our children's children are to live and die? Is it not right that, in obedience to this sentiment of patriotism, we should desire to see a Canadian Church? Ought we not to try to forget the feuds imported from beyond the sea? We know we did right in so acting and so forgetting. Other Churches have approved our action. When we united, the Anglican Synod of the Diocese of Toronto sent their hearty Christian congratulations, to whom?—to these gentlemen as representing the Church of Scotland? No; to us who had united; and that Anglican Synod even said that they were willing to consider the question of union with us on the basis of the first four General Councils. They named even a basis of union to show how they interpreted the act we had done. The other Churches recognized our act; history has recognized; and I believe, with all submission, that this Parliament will recognize it, because the glory of this Parliament is the glory that irradiates every true Parliament, namely, that it represents the people.

THE CHAIRMAN.—In accordance with the understanding, another gentleman should be heard on the side of the Old Kirk. I now call upon Mr. McLean to address you.

PRINCIPAL GRANT.—Not the Old Kirk, but the anti-Unionists.

REV. MR. LANG.—I cannot allow that remark to pass. I protest, Mr. Chairman, when you say from the Chair that a gentleman from the other side is to be heard, that we should be met by these epithets. When you speak of this side by the proper term we are told on the other side that this is the anti-Unionist side. Now, Sir, I must distinctly take exception to the statement. I am not an anti-Unionist,

I am a Minister, and Moderator of the Synod of the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland. I think it is only fair the Committee should understand of what spirit at least some of the gentlemen are, in regard to those who honestly and conscientiously hold an opposite opinion. I think there might be common courtesy and common fairness shown. We have not hurled epithets at those on the other side. We have always spoken of them with kindness. We have not objected to them going into the union; we wish them God speed.

PRINCIPAL GRANT.—We cannot allow Mr. Lang to take the name of the Old Kirk, simply because that would unchurch ourselves. They call us secessionists, and other similarly absurd terms. We must call them anti-Unionists, for if we give them our name we unchurch ourselves.

THE CHAIRMAN.—I did not intend to decide the question. I used the word Kirk for shortness, as the other distinction is a very long one, and takes some time to utter. We will now hear Mr. McLean.

APPENDIX.

INDEPENDENCE OF THE CANADIAN KIRK DECLARED WITHOUT RESERVE IN 1844 AND IN 1833.

In 1844 the Synod of the Canadian Church passed, without a dissenting voice, the following Act, *which was made a fundamental and essential part of its constitution, to which every Minister had to assent, and to which Mr. Lang assented, before he could be inducted in Canada.*

“Whereas this Synod has always, from its first establishment, possessed a perfectly free and supreme jurisdiction over all the Congregations and Ministers in connection therewith ; and although the independence and freedom of this Synod, in regard to all things spiritual, cannot be called in question, but has been repeatedly and in most explicit terms affirmed, not only by itself, but by the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, yet, as in present circumstances it is expedient that this independence be asserted and declared by a special Act :

“It is hereby declared, That this Synod has always claimed and possessed, does now possess, and ought always in all time coming to have and exercise a perfectly free, full, final, supreme and uncontrolled power of jurisdiction, discipline and government, in regard to all matters, ecclesiastical and spiritual, over all the Ministers, Elders, Church Members and Congregations under its care, without the right of review, appeal, complaint or reference by or to any other Court or Courts whatsoever, in any form or under any pretence ; and that in all cases that may come before it for judgment the decisions and deliverances of this Synod shall be final. And this Synod further declares that, if any encroachment on this supreme power and authority shall be attempted or threatened by any person or persons, Court or Courts whatsoever, then the Synod; and each and every member thereof, shall, to the utmost of their power, resist and oppose the same. And whereas the words in the designation of the Synod “*in connection with the Church of Scotland,*” have been misunderstood or misrepresented by many persons, it is hereby declared that the said words imply no right of jurisdiction or control, in any form whatsoever, by the Church of Scotland over this Synod, but denote merely the connection of origin, identity of standards,

and ministerial and Church communion. And it is further enacted, that this supreme and free jurisdiction is a fundamental and essential part of the Constitution of this Synod ; and, that this may be fully known to all those who may hereafter seek admission into our Church, it is enjoined that all Presbyteries shall preserve a copy of this Act, and cause it to be read over to, and assented to by, every Minister and Probationer who may apply for ordination or induction into any pastoral charge."

The Mother Church held precisely the same view. In the same year, 1844, the following words occur in a letter from the Colonial Committee of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland to the said Synod of the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland : "The Church of Scotland has never claimed any authority nor exercised any control over your Synod ; neither has she ever possessed, or desired to possess, the right of any such interference. Her efforts have been limited to the cultivation of brotherly affection and the rendering of pecuniary aid to those who had many claims on her regard."

The relations were the same, from the formation of the Canadian Synod :—

What is called the Declaratory Enactment, passed by the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, and appearing in the Minutes of the said Synod of the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland, at page 42 and 43 of Synod Minutes of eighteen hundred and thirty-three, in reply to the application of the said Synod found on page 4 of the Minutes, June seventh, eighteen hundred and thirty-one, shows this, that the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland simply undertook to give advice on any question with regard to which said Synod may choose to consult the Church of Scotland, and afford said Synod such aid as it may be in the power of the Colonial Committee of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland to give in all matters affecting their rights and interests. This Declaratory Enactment was declared by the said Synod to form part of the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland, as appears at page 43 of the Minutes of said Synod, eighteen hundred and thirty-three.

enacted,
essential
be fully
Church,
this Act,
ister and
any pas-

the same
Colonial
ad to the
tion with
claimed
ither has
ch inter-
brotherly
ad many

Canadian

General
minutes of
onnection
minutes of
n of the
eighteen
ly of the
question
hurch of
power of
hurch of
es. This
a part of
onnection
minutes of

